



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,110	07/02/2001	Nenad Rijavec	BLD9010021	5070
30743	7590 06/28/2005		EXAMINER .	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.			COUSO, JOSE L	
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				FAFER NUMBER
RESTON, V.	A 20190		2621	
			DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)						
		09/896,110	RIJAVEC ET AL.						
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
		Jose L. Couso	2621						
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	ation appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence ad	ldress					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above, the maximum statuse of the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, ma ication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) I, by statute, cause the application to becom	y a reply be timely filed f thirty (30) days will be considered timel MONTHS from the mailing date of this c e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).						
Status									
1)[🗆	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 09 June 2005.							
·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)	·—								
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
		diagtion							
4)[Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.								
€\□	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)[8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicat	ion Papers	·							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.									
10)	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner. Note the attac	hed Office Action or form P1	ΓΟ-152.					
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action	ocuments have been received. Ocuments have been received in the priority documents have be all Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No een received in this National	Stage					
Attachmen		Е	_						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC		ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date						
3) 🔲 Inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT r No(s)/Mail Date	, <u>– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –</u>	of Informal Patent Application (PTC	O-152)					

Application/Control Number: 09/896,110 Page 2

Art Unit: 2621

1. Applicant's arguments filed June 9, 2005, with respect to claims 1-6, have been fully considered and are persuasive, the examiner is therefore withdrawing the prior art rejection of claims 1-6.

- 2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 3. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6 are drawn to a method of coding that merely manipulates data or an abstract idea, or merely solves a mathematical problem without a limitation to a practical application in the technological arts.

In order for a claimed invention to accomplish a practical application, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result" *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02 (see MPEP 2106.II.A). A practical application can be achieved through recitation of "a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technological arts is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan", or "limited to a practical application within the technological arts" (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)). Currently, claims 1-6 meet neither of these criteria. In order to for the claimed process to produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result, recitation of one or more of the following elements is suggested:

 The manipulation of data that represents a physical object or activity transformed from outside the computer (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(i)). Application/Control Number: 09/896,110

Art Unit: 2621

• A recitation of a physical transformations outside the computer, for example in

the form of pre or post computer processing activity (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(i)).

Page 3

• A direct recitation of a practical application in the technological arts (MPEP 2106

IVB2(b)(ii)).

4. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-10 are drawn to non-functional descriptive material.

MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a) (Nonfunctional Descriptive Material) states:

"Descriptive material that cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed does not constitute a statutory process, machine, manufacture or composition of matter and should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101."

"Where certain types of descriptive material, such as music, art, photographs and mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data, are merely stored so as to be read or outputted by a computer without creating any functional interrelationship, either as part of the stored data or as part of the computing process performed by the computer, then such descriptive material alone does not impart functionality either to the data as so structured, or to the computer."

"For example, music is commonly sold to consumers in the form of a compact disc. In such cases, the know compact disc acts as nothing more than a carrier for nonfunctional descriptive material. The purely nonfunctional descriptive material cannot alone provide the practical application for the manufacture."

MPEP 2106.IV.B.1 (Nonstatutory Subject Matter) states:

"When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement".

Claims 7-10 currently recites "a data format for a block of encoded data". There is no functional relationship imparted by this data to a computing device, applicant's amendment which inserts "decoder" in the claims is not a computing device. Therefore, the claims are drawn to non-functional descriptive material which is non-statutory per se. The fact that the claim recites a computer readable medium does not provide the utility (i.e., practical application in the technological arts) required under 35 U.S.C. 101 for the manufacture.

5. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-10 are drawn to functional descriptive material which can be embodied on a computer readable medium (i.e., "data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component" at MPEP 2106.IV.B(1)). However, the program/algorithm itself merely manipulates data or an abstract idea, or merely solves a mathematical problem without a limitation to a practical application in the technological arts. MPEP 2106.IV.B.2(a) (Statutory Product Claims) states:

"A claim limited to a ... manufacture, which has a practical application in the technological arts, is statutory."

In order for a claimed invention to accomplish a practical application, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result" *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02 (see MPEP 2106.II.A). Currently, the claim does not recite a practical application. In order to for the claimed product to produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result, recitation of one or more of the following elements is suggested:

Application/Control Number: 09/896,110

Art Unit: 2621

 The manipulation of data that represents a physical object or activity transformed from outside the computer (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(i)).

Page 5

- A physical transformations outside the computer, for example in the form of pre
 or post computer processing activity (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(i)).
- A direct recitation of a practical application in the technological arts (MPEP 2106 IVB2(b)(ii)).
- 6. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 7-10 are drawn to functional descriptive material NOT claimed as residing on a computer readable medium. MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a) (Functional Descriptive Material) states:

"Data structures not claimed as embodied in a computer-readable medium are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer."

"Such claimed data structures do not define any structural or functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized."

Claims 7-10, while defining a decoder, does not define a "computer-readable medium" and is thus non-statutory for that reasons. A decoder can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to embody the program on "computer-readable medium" in order to make the claim statutory.

Art Unit: 2621

"In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with the data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory." - MPEP 2106.IV.B.1(a)

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jose L. Couso whose telephone number is (571) 272-7388. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Mancuso, can be reached on (703) 272-7695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the USPTO contact Center whose telephone number is (703) 308-4357.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jic June 21, 2005

JOSE L. COUSE)
PRIMARY EXAMINER